

Application No. 10/627,135  
Attorney Docket No. 53248/41673

**Remarks:**

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to the inventor Jim Riley and his representative during the personal interview conducted on Aug. 23, 2005. This amendment is intended to memorialize the discussions during that interview and place the claims in condition in allowance.

At present, the independent claims under examination include claim 10 and 22. Taking claim 10 first, it presently is rejected as being obvious over the combination of Attia and Alpa. As best understood, Alpa is being relied upon for disclosing the location of two slots for fastening a wristband about a person's wrist. However, as discussed during the interview, Alpa's slots are formed between three layers of material, the top two of which are heat welded to a bottom layer, the bottom layer extending the length of the wristband. Furthermore, these two slots are on the same side of the face ply along the length of the wristband. Claim 10 originally, and before entry of this amendment, recited that the slots were on opposite sides of the face ply portion so that it was believed to be patentable as submitted. This amendment more specifically recites that the opposite sides are taken along the length of the face ply portion so that there can be no doubt as to their relative location. With this clarifying amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the claim is fully allowable over the cited art.

Claim 22 was discussed at some length, and the Examiner courteously pointed out some grammatical anomalies which have been corrected in newly submitted claim 38. New claim 38 also corrects the claimed combination to recite that the pair of slots are formed in the laminating layer. As noted above, the slots in Alpa are formed not in a single layer of a laminating portion but instead require three layers of material. Thus, claim 38, which corresponds to previous claim 22 now cancelled, is believed to be patentable over the cited art. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection in view of this clarifying amendment.


It is noted that the present application was the subject of a restriction requirement, such that claims 1-9, 20, 21, and 24-37 were withdrawn from examination. Upon entry of this amendment, it is believed that the claims being examined will be allowed such that the restriction requirement should be re-considered. For example, claim 21 recites a first and second slot

Application No. 10/627,135  
Attorney Docket No. 53248/41673

formed by a die cut in a lamination layer, which is the basis, inter alia, for patentability for some of the claims under examination. Claim 1 recites a wristband having at least one slot through which the strap portion is inserted which covers a wristband with two slots, at least in part. The other claims in the application similarly share many of the same recited elements and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the restriction requirement, withdraw it, and allow the remaining claims.

Should the Examiner find that there are any remaining matters standing in the way of allowance, she is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's representative any time after Sep. 18 so as to expedite issuance hereof.

Respectfully submitted,  
Thompson Coburn LLP

By:   
Matthew J. Himich, Reg. No. 47,650  
One US Bank Plaza  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
(314) 552-6000  
(314) 552-7000 (fax)